

NOV 29 2006

REMARKS

All of the previously-presented claims were canceled, and new claims 35-54 have been added. Reexamination and reconsideration of the claims are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action dated August 31, 2006, the Examiner objected to the Specification in that, on page 8, paragraph "0031" (which Applicant believes should read "0037"), line 2, the term "dielectric" was believed to be in error. Applicant amended paragraph [0037] above to change "dielectric" to ~~dielectric~~. Thus, the objection to the Specification is believed to be overcome.

The Examiner rejected Claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the phrase "a second side having been pressed together" was deemed to be indefinite and "a second side" lacked antecedent basis. Claim 17 has been canceled above, and new claims 35-54 do not contain the phrase "a second side having been pressed together". Thus, this rejection is believed to be overcome, and Applicant does not anticipate such a rejection on the new claims.

The Examiner also rejected claims 27, 29 and 34 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically, the Examiner required Applicant to show support of the limitation "hermeticity-increasing layer is not electrically conductive" from the original specification. While claims 27, 29 and 34 have been canceled above, new claims 40, 47 and 53 are substantially the same as the canceled claims. Thus, in anticipation of a similar rejection of the new claims, Applicant wishes to direct the Examiner's attention to

10030711-1

8

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

paragraph [0031] on page 6 of the original Specification, the first sentence of which reads (emphasis added): "The gasket 42 is coated with a thin layer 47 of a material, **such as gold, copper, glass, or silicon-nitride**, that increases the hermeticity of the gasket 42." Here, Applicant has given two specific examples of hermeticity-increasing materials (glass and silicon-nitride) that are known in the art to be non-electrically conductive, i.e., glass and ceramics such as silicon-nitride are commonly utilized as non-conductive electrical insulators. Support for new claims 40, 47 and 53 can also be found on pages 10 and 11 of Applicant's Specification, paragraph [0042], the second sentence thereof, which reads as follows (emphasis added): "Gasket 42 may provide a hermetic seal between the substrates 21 and 24, as described above, **without there being electrically conductive connections** between the substrates 21 and 24." Thus, the rejection of claims 27, 29 and 34 (as well as the anticipated rejection of new claims 40, 47 and 53) under 35 U.S.C. §112 is believed to be overcome.

Claims 17-18, 20, 23, 25-26, 28, 30 and 32-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Matsuzaki et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,142,101. Claims 17-18, 20, 23, 25-26, 28, 30 and 32-33 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Kalinoski et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,096,413. Claims 17-20 and 22-34 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsuzaki et al. '101 or Kalinoski et al. '413. These claims have been canceled above. New claims 35-54 are believed to be allowable over the cited references for the reasons discussed below.

Matsuzaki et al. '101 is directed to an EMI-shielding gasket (10) covered with a metal mesh (14) that is installed in a gap (2) in the housing (1) of an electronic

component. By installing an EMI-shielding gasket (10) in a housing (1), electromagnetic waves are reflected and/or absorbed by the conductive housing (1) and the gasket (10). [See col. 1, lines 25-34].

Kalinowski et al. '413 is also directed to an EMI-shielding gasket (1) mounted on a substrate (2) to be shielded. Again, the EMI-shielding gasket (1) is adapted to shield an electronic device (not shown) from electromagnetic waves.

Neither reference, either singly or in combination, discloses or suggests Applicant's new claim 35, with particular emphasis on the items emphasized below:

35. A device, comprising:

a first substrate having an upper surface with a gasket formed thereon, said gasket being composed of a first compliant material and at least partially coated with a hermeticity-increasing material;

a second substrate having an upper surface with at least one electrically conductive area thereon;

wherein said first substrate and said second substrate are pressed together with said upper surface of said first substrate facing said upper surface of said second substrate, such that said gasket is deformed; and

wherein said gasket and said upper surface of said second substrate form an enclosed chamber that is hermetically sealed, and wherein at least one electrically-conductive element is located within said enclosed chamber and is in direct contact with said at least one electrically conductive area on said second substrate.

First, as the Examiner notes on page 4 of the Office Action, neither Matsuzaki et al. '101 nor Kalinoski et al. '413 discloses or suggests a device having a hermeticity-increasing coating on a gasket. In addition, neither reference discloses or suggests a device whereby a gasket and an upper surface of a substrate form a hermetically sealed, enclosed chamber as claimed in new claim 35. Nor would such a combination be obvious since shielding electronic components from electromagnetic waves is a completely different problem than **hermetically sealing** electronic components within an enclosed chamber. Furthermore, neither reference discloses or suggests a device having at least one electrically-conductive element located within a hermetically-sealed, enclosed chamber that is in direct contact with an electrically conductive area on a second substrate as claimed in new claim 35.

For at least the above reasons, Applicant believes that new claim 35 is allowable over the cited references. Claims 36-42 are believed to be allowable as depending on an allowable base claim, and further for the novel and non-obvious combinations of elements disclosed therein.

Neither reference, either singly or in combination, discloses or suggests Applicant's new claim 43, with particular emphasis on the items emphasized below:

43. A device, comprising:

a first substrate having an upper surface with a gasket and at least one post formed thereon, said gasket being composed of a first compliant material and coated with a hermeticity-increasing material, and said at least one post being composed of a second compliant material and coated with an electrically-conductive material;

a second substrate having an upper surface with at least one electrically conductive area thereon;

wherein said first substrate and said second substrate are pressed together with said upper surface of said first substrate facing said upper surface of said second substrate, such that ***said gasket and said at least one post of said first substrate are deformed***; and

wherein said gasket and said upper surface of said second substrate form an enclosed chamber that is hermetically sealed, and said at least one post is positioned within said chamber and in direct contact with said at least one electrically conductive area on said second substrate.

New claim 43 is allowable for the same reasons as new claim 35 discussed above. This claim is allowable for the further reason that neither cited reference discloses or suggests a device having a first substrate with a gasket and at least one post formed thereon, whereby the gasket is composed of a first compliant material and coated with a hermeticity-increasing material, and the post is composed of a second compliant material and coated with an electrically-conductive material. Nor does either reference disclose or suggest a device having at least one electrically-conductive post located within a hermetically-sealed, enclosed chamber that is in direct contact with an electrically conductive area on a second substrate as claimed in new claim 43. In addition, neither reference discloses or suggests a device having a coated, compliant gasket and a coated, compliant post that are pressed and deformed between first and second substrates as claimed in new claim 43.

For at least the above reasons, Applicant believes that new claim 43 is allowable over the cited references. Claims 44-48 are believed to be allowable as depending on an allowable base claim, and further for the novel and non-obvious combinations of elements disclosed therein.

New claim 49 is specifically directed to the embodiment shown in Figs. 10-14 of Applicant's drawings. Neither reference, either singly or in combination, discloses or suggests Applicant's new claim 49, with particular emphasis on the items emphasized below:

49. A device, comprising:

a first substrate having an upper surface with a gasket and at least one post formed thereon, said gasket having an inner surface and an outer surface and being composed of a first compliant material, said at least one post being composed of a second compliant material and coated with an electrically-conductive material;

a second substrate having an upper surface with at least one electrically conductive area formed thereon;

wherein said first substrate and said second substrate are pressed together with said upper surface of said first substrate facing said upper surface of said second substrate, such that ***said gasket and said at least one post of said first substrate are deformed;*** and

wherein said outer surface of said gasket, a portion of said upper surface of said first substrate, and a portion of said upper surface of said second substrate are coated with a hermeticity-increasing material such that said inner surface of said gasket and said upper surface of

said second substrate form an enclosed chamber that is hermetically sealed, and said at least one post is positioned within said enclosed chamber and in direct contact with said at least one electrically conductive area on said second substrate.

New claim 49 is allowable because neither cited reference discloses or suggests a device having a first substrate with a gasket and at least one post formed thereon, whereby the gasket is composed of a first compliant material and the post is composed of a second compliant material and coated with an electrically-conductive material. Nor does either reference disclose or suggest a device having at least one electrically-conductive post located within a hermetically-sealed, enclosed chamber that is in direct contact with an electrically conductive area on a second substrate as claimed in new claim 49. In addition, neither reference discloses or suggests a device having a coated, compliant gasket and a coated, compliant post that are pressed and deformed between first and second substrates as claimed in new claim 49. Furthermore, neither reference discloses or suggests a device having an enclosed chamber that is hermetically sealed by coating portions of a gasket and two substrates with a hermeticity-increasing material as claimed in new claim 49.

For at least the above reasons, Applicant believes that new claim 49 is allowable over the cited references. Claims 50-54 are believed to be allowable as depending on an allowable base claim, and further for the novel and non-obvious combinations of elements disclosed therein.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

Conclusion


NOV 29 2006

Applicant believes that all of the claims pending in the application (claims 35-54) are allowable over the cited art. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider the application and grant an early allowance. Should the Examiner have any questions, Applicant's attorney may be contacted at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

KLAAS, LAW, O'MEARA & MALKIN, P.C.

November 29, 2006


Nellie C. Kaufman, Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 34,689
P.O. Box 1920
Denver, Colorado 80201-1920
(303) 298-9888